

2

①

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CUTTACK BENCH, CUTTACK

Original Application No.370 of 1993

Date of Decision:30.7.1993

Balakrishna Sahoo

Applicant(s)

VERSUS

Union of India & Others

Respondent(s)

(FOR INSTRUCTIONS)

1. Whether it be referred to reporters or not ? No
2. Whether it be circulated to all the Benches of the Central Administrative Tribunals or not ? No

  
MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

30 JUL 93

  
VICE-CHAIRMAN



3

(2)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CUTTACK BENCH: CUTTACK

Original Application No.370 of 1993

Date of Decision: 30.7.1993

Balakrushna Sahoo

Applicant

VERSUS

Union of India & Others

Respondents

For the applicant

M/s. P.V. Ramdas  
P.V.B. Rao  
Advocates

For the respondents

Mr. UB Mohapatra  
Standing Counsel  
(Central Government)

C O R A M:

THE HONOURABLE MR. K. P. ACHARYA, VICE-CHAIRMAN

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. RAJENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (ADMN)

...

JUDGMENT

MR. K. P. ACHARYA, VICE-CHAIRMAN, In this application under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the petitioner prays to quash the selection of Opposite Party No.4, and to issue a direction to Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 to consider the case of the petitioner as E.D.D.A., Durdwan Branch Office under Mahipur Sub-Office, or in the alternative, a direction be issued to the opposite parties to adjust the petitioner in some other post.

2. The petitioner has been appointed as E.D.D.A. in the said post office and had worked for about two and half years. Opposite Party No.5 one Shri B.K.Sahoo invoked the jurisdiction of this Bench in Original Application No.39 of 1991 and the Division Bench directed quashing of the



appointment of OP No.5 in that case and ordered fresh selection. Opposite Party No.4 in the present case has been selected for the post in question. Hence this application has been filed with the aforesaid prayer.

3. We did not think it necessary to keep this matter pending because in the interest of justice, it needs to be expeditiously disposed of. We have heard Mr.P.V.Balakrishna Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.U.B.Mohapatra, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the opposite parties. At this stage, we find no reason to quash the appointment order of OP No.4, but we would direct OP Nos. 2 and 3 to find out a suitable berth for the petitioner and give him appointment as he has worked satisfactorily for two and a half years. Thus the application is accordingly disposed of. No cost.

MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

30.7.93

VICE-CHAIRMAN

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Cuttack Bench Cuttack  
dated the 30.7.1993/ B.K.Sahoo

